

Communication from Public

Name: Barbara Broide

Date Submitted: 08/25/2025 06:25 PM

Council File No: 22-1154-S2

Comments for Public Posting: There are many issues that need to be considered during any further consideration of a kiosk ad program by the City, Some of those issues are listed below: A) Why should there be a separate ad kiosk program when the STAP program and its contract include kiosks as part of that already approved program? Does the City need kiosks if LA has an ad program for transit-related structures? Smaller nearby cities that have adopted kiosk programs do not have ad programs for their transit shelters. STAP provides shade and shelter-needed community benefits. Ad kiosks do not provide shade and shelter and will compete with STAP for “out-of-home” ad dollars thus undermining STAP’s financial stability and success. Threatening STAP’s financial stability calls into question the City’s commitment to providing shade and shelter for transit riders as the climate grows hotter. B) The CAO's analysis of financial impacts of "IKE" on the STAP program and ad revenues should include input from outdoor advertising industry experts and not be influenced by IKE, its lobbyists or supporters of the program. C) The wisdom of having different departments manage different programs on the very same public right-of-way (perhaps even on the same block) must be seriously questioned. It is a recipe for conflict, confusion, and competition. There should not be a second sidewalk-based ad program. If there is, the Public Works Department should manage it with the same staff that provide staffing to STAP for efficiency and to avoid duplication of efforts. Staff costs needed should be taken from program revenues to assure that the staff needed to administer the program will not be cut leaving program management to chance. D). It is important to note that the Tourism Dept (and Tourism & Convention Board) have had a long-term relationship with vendor IKE Smart Cities/Orange Barrel Media (OBM) which strongly suggests a bias or lack of objectivity on their part. Companies who in the past indicated interest in bidding on this program likely understand and/or suspect that the process is rigged to favor IKE/OBM. This, based upon efforts to advance the kiosk program as the IKE program, including the attempt to gain approval of the program on a no-bid contract based on an IKE RFP for a smaller IKE program in Texas. E). That an environmental analysis under CEQA be conducted under the supervision of the City Attorney's office by the Bureau of Engineering with participation and input

from the Planning Dept. Full documentation as to level of CEQA compliance is needed. F). Require that the drafting of the RFP be done only after a robust community outreach program to solicit input relevant to defining the scope of the program and its RFP. G) Require that the program comply with all community plans, overlays, CPIOs, NODs, PODs, Historical Preservation Zone language that bans, limits or restricts commercial off-site signage whether on private property or within the public right-of way. Kiosk program to comply with all limitations and requirements applied to STAP program. H). Require the kiosk program, if it moves forward, to comply with the City's General Plan Mobility Element which prohibits ad structures within 500 feet of the center line of a designated Scenic Highway. I) Require the kiosk program, if it moves forward, to maintain a minimum distance of 500 feet from any sensitive biological resources, including parks, designated open space, wildlife refuges, wetlands, etc. The relationship between City actors and IKE Smart Cities/OBM and their lobbyists is of great concern. There is a perceived lack of objectivity on the part of the Dept. of Tourism that suggests that this project should no longer be considered by or have involvement with that Dept. that is closely related to and has overlaps with the Tourism and Convention Bureau. The Tourism and Convention Bureau signed a Letter of Intent with IKE/OBM in January of 2017 giving IKE/OBM exclusive rights to operating an LA ad kiosk program. The program ran into administrative obstacles and could not proceed before the Letter of Intent expired. IKE, however, has continued to lobby for their program. The TCB program had revenues coming to their promotional programs. It is not at all clear as to where kiosk program revenues will be directed-revenues that will not be going to the STAP program, the RAISE initiatives or to Council District office funds for community benefits that the STAP program provides. It is strongly suggested that instead of reacting to advertising programs that happen to come before the City Council (as was the case with the Metro TCn program and now with this kiosk program), that the City instead explore the best ways to generate ad revenues while reducing sign blight and minimizing the use of the PUBLIC right-of-way for commercial advertising. The public wants to see trees planted -- not digital kiosks with changing ad messages installed on their streets.